

An obstruction to conservation of volume in contact dynamics *

Leonid Polterovich
School of Mathematical Sciences
Tel Aviv University
69978 Tel Aviv
Israel

September 26, 2000

preliminary version

1 Introduction and results

A diffeomorphism of a smooth orientable closed manifold is called *conservative* if it has an invariant measure given by a strictly positive continuous density with respect to a smooth volume form. For diffeomorphisms, there are no global topological obstructions to conservativity. In fact a result of Moser [Mo] implies that every diffeomorphism can be isotoped to a conservative one. In the present note we observe that, in contrast to this, in the contact category such obstructions do exist.

For a closed manifold X consider the space of cooriented contact elements $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ endowed with the standard contact structure (see e.g. [MS]). Given a contact diffeomorphism f of $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$, write I_f for the inverse of the induced automorphism of the first cohomology group $H^1(\mathbb{P}_+T^*X, \mathbb{R})$ (so the mapping $f \rightarrow I_f$ is a homomorphism of the corresponding groups). We start with the following result, which deals with the case when X is the n -dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^n$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let f be a conservative contactomorphism of $\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^n$, $n \geq 3$. Then I_f is a periodic automorphism: $I_f^m = id$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

One can easily show that this result is sharp in the following sense: every periodic automorphism of $H^1(\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R})$ preserving integer cohomology can be represented as I_f for some conservative contactomorphism f (see §2). The case of the 2-torus $\mathbb{T}^2$ is slightly more involved and will be considered separately

*Supported by the United States -Israel Binational Science Foundation grant 1999086

in Theorem 2.2. Below we give a quantitative version of Theorem 1.1 (see Theorem 1.3) as well as extension to general manifolds X (see Theorem 1.4) .

The *lack of conservativity* (which some times we call *dissipation*) can be measured in the following way (cf. [KH], §5.1). Let f be a contactomorphism of a closed contact manifold (M, ξ) , where the contact structure ξ is assumed to be cooriented. Pick a contact form λ on M , which means that $\xi = \text{Kernel } \lambda$ and λ agrees with the coorientation. Note that $f^*\lambda/\lambda$ is a non-vanishing function on M . Consider a sequence of real numbers

$$r_k(f, \lambda) = \max_{x \in M} |\log |(f^*)^{-k} \lambda / \lambda||, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since any other contact form λ' on (M, ξ) satisfies $\lambda' = F\lambda$ for some positive function F on M , we have

$$|r_k(f, \lambda) - r_k(f, \lambda')| \leq \text{const} \quad (1)$$

for all k . A contactomorphism f of (M, ξ) is called *elliptic*, if the sequence $r_k(f, \lambda)$ is bounded and *hyperbolic* if there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$r_k(f, \lambda) > ck \quad (2)$$

for all sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There are contactomorphisms such that the sequence r_k has intermediate growth (for instance, $r_k \sim \log k$), but we will not focus on them below. When f is hyperbolic, put $\chi(f) = \sup c$, where c is taken from (2). In view of (1) the type of f and the value of $\chi(f)$ for hyperbolic f does not depend on the specific choice of a contact form λ .

Proposition 1.2. *A conservative contactomorphism is elliptic.*

Proof. Take a contact form λ on M . Assume that f is a coorientation-preserving conservative contactomorphism (the coorientation-reversing case can be treated similarly), so f preserves a volume form $F\lambda(d\lambda)^n$ for some continuous positive function F . A simple calculation shows that then f preserves the continuous contact form $F^{\frac{1}{n+1}}\lambda$, and it is easy to conclude that f is elliptic. $\square$

For a linear automorphism I of a finite-dimensional real vector space put

$$s(I) = \max |\log |c||,$$

where c runs over all (complex) eigenvalues of I . If $s(I) > 0$, the automorphism I is called *hyperbolic*.

Theorem 1.3. *Let f be a contactomorphism of $\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^n$, $n \geq 2$. Assume that I_f is hyperbolic. Then f is hyperbolic and $\chi(f) \geq s(I_f)$.*

Let us turn to the case when X is a general closed manifold. For a diffeomorphism e of X write Γ_e for the connected component of the group of all contactomorphisms of $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ containing the canonical lift of e to $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$. We

are able to prove a version of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 under an additional assumption that the contactomorphism f lies in Γ_e . As a compensation, we estimate $\chi(f)$ in terms of its action on the fundamental group rather than homology. Denote by $\mathcal{C}$ the set of conjugacy classes of $\pi_1(X)$. Fix a system of generators of $\pi_1(X)$. Given $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$, write $\ell(\gamma)$ for the minimal word length of an element representing γ . Let $J : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be the map induced by e . Put

$$\bar{s}(J) = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{C}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \ell(J^n \gamma).$$

It is easy to see that this quantity does not depend on the choice of a system of generators. We call J *hyperbolic* if $\bar{s}(J) > 0$.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume that J is hyperbolic. Then every contactomorphism $f \in \Gamma_e$ is hyperbolic and $\chi(f) \geq \bar{s}(J)$. In particular, f is non-conservative.*

Denote by I the inverse of the automorphism of $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ induced by e . It is easy to see that $\bar{s}(J) \geq s(I)$.

Corollary 1.5. *Assume that I is hyperbolic. Then every contactomorphism $f \in \Gamma_e$ is hyperbolic and $\chi(f) \geq s(I)$.*

Here is an example where Theorem 1.4 gives a better estimate than Corollary 1.5. Let X be a closed oriented surface of genus ≥ 2 . There exists a pseudo-Anosov diffeomorphism of X acting *trivially* on $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ (see e.g. [LP]). On the other hand every pseudo-Anosov diffeomorphism induces a hyperbolic map $J : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ (see [FLP]), so $\bar{s}(J) > s(I) = 0$.

There are several possible viewpoints on the dissipation phenomenon described above. One of them is closely related to *diffusion* for symplectomorphisms of cotangent bundles. We use it in the next section in order to prove Theorem 1.1 (and its version for the 2-torus) and 1.3. Another approach based on the isometric action of the contact mapping class group on the moduli space of contact forms is presented in §3 where we prove Corollary 1.5. This action is studied with the use of symplectic shapes introduced by Sikorav and Eliashberg. In §4 we prove Theorem 1.4 using Floer-Hofer symplectic homology theory. Finally, §5 contains some speculations and open problems, and in particular we discuss some duality between symplectic homology and shapes. Let us emphasize that our decision to present a separate proof of Corollary 1.5 is related to the fact that it is much more transparent than the more general argument given in §4.

Acknowledgment. I thank Paul Biran, Dima Burago, Yasha Eliashberg, Misha Farber and Karl Friedrich Siburg for very useful discussions. I am grateful to Kai Cieliebak and Jean-Claude Sikorav for valuable comments on the first draft of the paper. The isometric action of the contact mapping class group presented in §4 appeared in a stimulating conversation with Eliashberg. Results of this paper were presented first in KIAS (Seoul) in Spring, 2000. I thank Yong-Geun Oh for his warm hospitality during this visit.

2 Symplectic diffusion

Our proof of the theorems stated above starts with the following *symplectization* procedure (see e.g. [MS]). For a closed manifold X consider its cotangent bundle $\pi : T^*X \rightarrow X$ endowed with the standard symplectic form $\Omega = dp \wedge dq$. Write Z for the zero section $\{p = 0\}$, and put $T_0^*X = T^*X \setminus Z$. The group $\mathbb{R}_+$ acts naturally on T_0^*X by $(p, q) \rightarrow (cp, q)$, $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and the corresponding space of orbits is naturally identified with $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$. Write $\tau : T_0^*X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ for the natural projection. Let us look more attentively at this fibration. A point $(p, q) \in T_0^*X$ represents a contact element ¹ $l = \text{Kernel}(p)$ at a point $q \in X$ cooriented by p , so $\tau(p, q) = (l, q)$. Further, p is considered as a covector, this time, on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ at a point $\tau(p, q)$ which sends any tangent vector $(\dot{l}, \dot{q})$ to $p(\dot{q})$. Its cooriented kernel is precisely the cooriented contact hyperplane on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$. In view of this discussion, every coorientation preserving contactomorphism f of $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ lifts to a unique $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant diffeomorphism ϕ of T_0^*X given by

$$\phi(p, q) = ((f^*)^{-1}p, f(\tau(p, q))),$$

which in addition turns out to be symplectic with respect to Ω . Vice versa, every $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant symplectomorphism of T_0^*X is the lift of a unique contact transformation.

Further, contact forms λ are in a one-to-one correspondence with smooth sections of the bundle $T_0^*X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_+T^*X$. Fix such a λ , and for a point $z = (p, q) \in T_0^*X$ set $|z| = p/\lambda$, where λ is taken at the point $\tau(z)$.

The construction above allows us to translate contact dissipation described in §1 into symplectic language. The next proposition is an immediate consequence of definitions, and its proof is left to the reader.

Proposition 2.1. *Let f be a coorientation preserving contactomorphism of $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$, and let ϕ be its lift to an $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant symplectomorphism of T_0^*X .*

- *f is elliptic if and only there exist constants $C > c > 0$ such that $c|z| < |\phi^k(z)| < C|z|$ for every $z \in T_0^*X$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- *f is hyperbolic if and only if there exists $c > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{z \in T_0^*X} \left| \log \frac{|\phi^k(z)|}{|z|} \right| > ck$$

for all sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. In this case $\chi(f) \geq c$.

Thus the fact that a contactomorphism f is non-elliptic can be interpreted as *diffusive* behavior of its symplectic lift ϕ , while hyperbolicity of f corresponds to exponentially fast diffusion.

Our approach to the study of symplectic diffusion described in §2 and §3 goes through symplectic topology of Lagrangian submanifolds in cotangent bundles.

¹That is a tangent hyperplane to X

Denote by $\mathcal{L}$ the space of all embedded Lagrangian submanifolds $L \subset T^*X$ diffeomorphic to X such that the projection $\pi|_L : L \rightarrow X$ induces an isomorphism $i_L : H^1(X, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^1(L, \mathbb{R})$. For a Lagrangian submanifold $L \in \mathcal{L}$ denote by $a(L) \in H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ the preimage of its Liouville class ² under i_L . The role played by Lagrangian submanifolds becomes especially transparent in the case when X is the torus $\mathbb{T}^n$.

Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 for $n \geq 3$: Assume without loss of generality that our contactomorphism f preserves the coorientation of the standard contact structure on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ (otherwise consider f^2 instead of f). Since $n \geq 3$, there is a natural identification

$$H^1(T_0^*\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R}) = H^1(\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R}) = H^1(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $\mathbb{R}^n$ stands for a fiber of $T^*\mathbb{T}^n$. With this identification I_f is an automorphism of $\mathbb{R}^n$ which preserves the lattice $H^1(\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}^n$. Denote by $\|w\|$ the Euclidean norm of a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Choose a contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^n$ such that $|(p, q)| = \|p\|$ for all $(p, q) \in T_0^*\mathbb{T}^n$.

Let ϕ be the symplectic lift of f to a symplectomorphism of $T_0^*\mathbb{T}^n$. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ consider the "flat" Lagrangian torus $L_v = \{p = v\}$. Observe that $a(\phi^k(L_v)) = I_f^k(v)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now we use a fundamental result due to Gromov [Gr1]: given $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, every Lagrangian torus $L \in \mathcal{L}$ with $a(L) = w$ intersects L_w . Pick a sequence of vectors v_k with $\|v_k\| = 1$ and set $w_k = I_f^k(v_k)$. We conclude that $\phi^k(L_{v_k})$ intersects L_{w_k} for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose now that I_f is not periodic. Since the operator norm of I_f^k goes to infinity ³ with k , there exists a sequence v_k as above such that $w_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore there exists a sequence z_k with $|z_k| = 1$ such that $|\phi^k(z_k)| \rightarrow \infty$. Hence f is non-elliptic in view of the first part of Proposition 2.1, and therefore f is non-conservative in view of Proposition 1.2. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Assume now that I_f is hyperbolic. Then the sequence v_k can be chosen in such a way that $|\log \|w_k\|| \geq s(I_f)k$ for all sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence we get a sequence of points z_k with $|z_k| = 1$ such that

$$|\log |\phi^k(z_k)|| \geq s(I_f)k$$

for all sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now the second part of Proposition 2.1 yields the hyperbolicity of f , as well as the inequality $\chi(f) \geq s(f)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3 for $n \geq 3$. $\square$

²The Liouville class of a Lagrangian submanifold L is represented by the restriction of the canonical 1-form pdq to L , see [MS].

³ Indeed, the automorphism I_f preserves the lattice $H^1(X, \mathbb{Z}) \subset H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$. Given $C > 0$, there is only a finite number of such automorphisms with operator norm $\leq C$ (since there is only a finite number of frames in $H^1(X, \mathbb{Z})$ consisting of vectors whose length does not exceed a given constant). Thus if the sequence $\|I_f^k\|$ contains an infinite bounded subsequence then $I_f^{k_1} = I_f^{k_2}$ for some $k_1 \neq k_2$, so I_f is periodic.

It remains to handle the case $n = 2$. Identify $\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^2$ with the 3-torus

$$\mathbb{T}^3 = \{p_1^2 + p_2^2 = 1\} \subset T^*\mathbb{T}^2.$$

Endow $\mathbb{T}^3$ with coordinates (θ, q_1, q_2) , where q_1, q_2 are coordinates in the base $\mathbb{T}^2$, while θ is the angular coordinate in the fiber. The standard contact structure on $\mathbb{T}^3$ is given by Kernel λ , where

$$\lambda = \cos 2\pi\theta dq_1 + \sin 2\pi\theta dq_2.$$

Identify $H^1(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R})$ with the space $\mathbb{R}^3$ generated by the classes $[d\theta], [dq_1], [dq_2]$, and consider the line V generated by $[d\theta]$. It was shown in [EP1] that an automorphism $I \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ of $\mathbb{R}^3$ can be represented by a contactomorphism (that is $I = I_f$ for some contactomorphism f) if and only if $I(V) = V$. Such an automorphism acts in the following way: $I([dx]) = \alpha[dx] + \beta[dy] + l[d\theta]$ and $I([dy]) = \gamma[dx] + \delta[dy] + m[d\theta]$ where the matrix

$$A_I = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \gamma \\ \beta & \delta \end{pmatrix}$$

belongs to $GL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and l, m are arbitrary integers. Here is an analogue of Theorem 1.1 for the 2-torus.

Theorem 2.2. *If an automorphism $I \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ represents a conservative contactomorphism of $\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^2$, the matrix A_I is periodic.*

Proof of Theorems 2.2 and 1.3 for $n = 2$: One should proceed exactly as in the case $n \geq 3$ presented above replacing I_f by A_I and taking into account that $s(I) = s(A_I)$ and that the Liouville class of a flat torus L_v transforms as follows: $a(\phi(L_v)) = A_I(v)$. $\square$

We conclude this section with a remark about sharpness of our results for tori. Consider first the case $n \geq 3$. Every periodic automorphism $I \in GL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ of $H^1(\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^n, \mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}^n$ is represented by a periodic contactomorphism f which preserves the coorientation. Indeed, take the matrix $(I^T)^{-1}$ (where I^T stands for the transposed matrix) and consider it as an algebraic automorphism of $\mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$. Define now f as the canonical lift of $(I^T)^{-1}$ to $\mathbb{P}_+T^*\mathbb{T}^n$. Every periodic coorientation preserving contactomorphism has an invariant contact form (use the obvious averaging procedure), and therefore has a smooth invariant measure.

In the case $n = 2$ periodicity of the matrix A_I does not imply periodicity of the automorphism I . It turns out that in this case there exist volume-preserving contactomorphisms f with non-periodic I_f .

Proposition 2.3. *Every automorphism $I \in SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ of $H^1(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R})$ with periodic A_I can be represented by a volume preserving contactomorphism.*

Proof. Indeed, each such I represents the action in cohomology of a diffeomorphism of the form $A^m B^k C$, where C is the canonical lift to $\mathbb{T}^3$ of a periodic automorphism of $\mathbb{T}^2$,

$$A(\theta, q_1, q_2) = (\theta, q_1 + \theta, q_2) \text{ and } B(\theta, q_1, q_2) = (\theta, q_1, q_2 + \theta).$$

Obviously, C is homotopic to a volume preserving contactomorphism of $\mathbb{T}^3$. It suffices to show that the same is valid for A and B . We explain this for A (the argument for B is analogous). In fact, the required volume preserving contactomorphism f homotopic to A is given by the following explicit formula:

$$f(\theta, q_1, q_2) = (\theta, q_1 + \theta - \frac{1}{4\pi} \sin 4\pi\theta, q_2 + \frac{1}{4\pi} \cos 4\pi\theta).$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

3 Contact mapping class group and shapes

The argument presented in §2 does not work for general manifolds X where, for instance, it can happen that every Lagrangian submanifold $L \in \mathcal{L}$ intersects the zero section $Z \subset T^*X$, so the action of the symplectic lift of a contactomorphism on Lagrangians is not defined! We go round this difficulty by using *symplectic shapes* introduced in [S1],[S2] and [E1]. Denote by $\mathcal{L}_0$ the subset of $\mathcal{L}$ consisting of all those L which are Lagrangian isotopic to the zero section. Given a domain $U \subset T^*X$ put

$$\text{Shape}(U) = \{a(L) \mid L \subset U, L \in \mathcal{L}_0\} \subset H^1(X, \mathbb{R}).$$

The following elementary properties of shapes are important for our purposes. First of all, shapes are monotone in the following sense: if $U \subset U'$ then $\text{Shape}(U) \subset \text{Shape}(U')$. Further, for $U \subset T^*X$ and $c > 0$ one has $\text{Shape}(cU) = c\text{Shape}(U)$. Finally, shapes behave nicely under symplectomorphisms ψ of T^*X preserving the zero section. Identify $H^1(T^*X, \mathbb{R})$ with $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ and write I_ψ for the inverse of the automorphism of $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ induced by ψ . Then $\text{Shape}(\psi U) = I_\psi \text{Shape}(U)$. This follows from two obvious facts: $a(\psi(L)) = I_\psi a(L)$ for every $L \in \mathcal{L}_0$, and $\psi(\mathcal{L}_0) = \mathcal{L}_0$. Here one should use that ψ preserves the zero section.

Let us formulate the last, crucial, property of shapes established by Sikorav with the use of Lagrangian intersections theory (see [S2], Proposition 2.6). Fix a contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$. Consider the subset

$$U_\lambda = \{(p, q) \in T_0^*X \mid p/\lambda < 1\} \cup Z \subset T^*X. \quad (3)$$

Obviously, $\text{Shape}(U_\lambda)$ is an open starshaped subset of $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$. Sikorav proved that in addition this subset is bounded.

Let (M, ξ) be a closed contact manifold with a cooriented contact structure. Denote by Γ the group of all contactomorphisms of (M, ξ) which preserve the coorientation, and by Γ_0 the connected component of the identity. Consider the *contact mapping class group*

$$G = \Gamma/\Gamma_0.$$

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the space of all contact forms on M . Put $W = \mathcal{F}/\Gamma_0$, and consider the action of the contact mapping class group G on W given by the standard action of diffeomorphisms on forms (cf. section 3.4 in [S2]). It turns out that G

acts by isometries of a natural pseudo-distance on W , and moreover this action carries non-trivial information on contact dissipation.

The pseudo-distance, say d , is defined as follows. Take two elements $a, b \in W$. Define

$$d(a, b) = \inf_{\alpha, \beta} \max_{x \in M} \left| \log \frac{\alpha}{\beta}(x) \right|,$$

where the infimum is taken over all pairs of contact forms $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}$ representing the classes a and b respectively.⁴

The group G acts on W by isometries of d . For an element $g \in G$ consider its *displacement*

$$\text{disp}(g) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} k^{-1} d(a, g^k a), \quad a \in W.$$

Obviously, the limit exists and does not depend on the choice of the point $a \in W$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $f \in \Gamma$ be a contactomorphism representing a class $g \in G$.*

- *If f is elliptic then for every $a \in W$ the trajectory $\{g^k a\}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is bounded;*
- *If $\text{disp}(g) > 0$ then f is hyperbolic and $\chi(f) \geq \text{disp}(g)$.*

This is an immediate consequence of definitions.

Our next goal is to prove Corollary 1.5 with the use of this language. Let $M = \mathbb{P}_+ T^*X$. For a contact form λ consider the set U_λ defined in (3). Clearly, $\text{Shape}(U_\lambda)$ does not alter when one considers $(f^*)^{-1}\lambda$ instead of λ for $f \in \Gamma_0$, so for $a \in W$ we have a well defined subset of $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ denoted by $\text{Shape}(a)$. This subset is open, starshaped and bounded. Denote by V the space of all open, bounded, starshaped domains of $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$. It carries a natural metric $\delta(A, B) = \inf \log c$, where the infimum is taken over all numbers $c > 1$ such that $B \subset cA$ and $A \subset cB$. Clearly, the map $\text{Shape} : (W, d) \rightarrow (V, \delta)$ does not increase the (pseudo)distance.

Denote by D the group of all linear automorphisms of $H^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ preserving the lattice $H^1(X, \mathbb{Z})$. Consider the usual mapping class group

$$K = \text{Diff}(X)/\text{Diff}_0(X)$$

of the manifold X . We have two natural homomorphisms:

- $j : K \rightarrow G$, which takes a diffeomorphism of X to its canonical lift to a contactomorphism of $\mathbb{P}_+ T^*X$;
- $I : K \rightarrow D$ which takes a diffeomorphism to the inverse of the induced automorphism in cohomology.

⁴It would be interesting to decide whether d is a non-degenerate distance on W or not. For instance, as Kai Cieliebak pointed out, d is non-degenerate when M is the circle S^1 equipped with the 0-dimensional cooriented contact structure. In this case contact forms are simply the volume forms on the circle while the group Γ_0 coincides with $\text{Diff}_0(S^1)$. Since any two volume forms are diffeomorphic if and only if their volumes coincide, we conclude that $W = \mathbb{R}_+$. Further, (W, d) is isometric to the Euclidean line $\mathbb{R}$, where the isometry is given by $x \rightarrow \log x$.

Proposition 3.2. *For every $u \in K$ and $a \in W$ we have $\text{Shape}(j(u)a) = I(u)\text{Shape}(a)$.*

For the proof, we need the following auxiliary fact which will be useful in the next section as well. Let ϕ be an $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant symplectomorphism of T_0^*X , and let ψ be a symplectomorphism of T^*X preserving the zero section whose restriction to T_0^*X is $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant. Assume that ϕ and $\psi|_{T_0^*X}$ are isotopic through $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant symplectomorphisms of T_0^*X . Take any contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ and put $U = U_\lambda$.

Proposition 3.3. *There exists $0.5 > \epsilon > 0$ and a symplectomorphism $h : T^*X \rightarrow T^*X$ such that $h \equiv \phi$ outside $0.5U$ and $h \equiv \psi$ in ϵU .*

Proof: Write $\phi = \psi\theta$, where θ is a $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant symplectomorphism of T_0^*X . Then there exists an isotopy θ_t , $t \in [0; 1]$ with $\theta_0 = \text{id}$ and $\theta_1 = \theta$ consisting of $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant symplectomorphisms of T_0^*X . It suffices to show that there exists a symplectomorphism σ of T^*X which coincides with θ outside $0.5U$ and equals identity in ϵU . Indeed, then $h = \psi\sigma$ is as required. To construct σ , choose $0.01 > \epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\cup_t \theta_t(T^*X \setminus 0.4U) \subset T^*X \setminus 4\epsilon U.$$

Let $B : T^*X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a cut off function which vanishes on $2\epsilon U$ and equals 1 outside $3\epsilon U$. The path θ_t is generated by a degree 1 homogeneous Hamiltonian function $A(z, t)$ on T_0^*X . Consider the Hamiltonian isotopy σ_t , $t \in [0; 1]$ generated by Hamiltonian $B(z)A(z, t)$. Clearly, $\sigma = \sigma_1$ is as required. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.2: Take a contact form λ representing some $a \in W$. Let e be a diffeomorphism of X representing u , and let f be a contactomorphism representing $j(u)$. Denote by ψ the canonical lift of e to a symplectomorphism of T^*X , and by ϕ the canonical lift of f to an $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant symplectomorphism of T_0^*X . Proposition 3.3 yields the existence of a symplectomorphism h of T^*X which coincides with ϕ outside $0.5U_\lambda$ and preserves the zero section. Looking at the action of h on the boundary of U we conclude that $h(U) = U_\beta$, where $\beta = (f^*)^{-1}\lambda$ is the contact form representing $j(u)a \in W$. Since for every Lagrangian submanifold $L \in \mathcal{L}_0$ one has $a(h(L)) = Ia(L)$ we conclude that $\text{Shape}(j(u)a) = I\text{Shape}(a)$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.5: For every $a \in W$

$$d(a, j(u)^k a) \geq \delta(\text{Shape}(a), I(u)^k \text{Shape}(a)).$$

Since I is hyperbolic, the expression at the right hand side grows asymptotically as $s(I)k$. Therefore, $\text{disp}(j(u)) \geq s(I) > 0$, so Proposition 3.1 implies that every contactomorphism f representing $j(u)$ is hyperbolic with $\chi(f) \geq s(I)$. $\square$

It would be interesting to explore further the isometric action of the mapping class group G on the space W . Let us mention also that one can define a canonical isometric action of G on the metric space Z introduced in [EP2] and prove a direct analogue of Proposition 3.1 in this case.

4 Using symplectic homology

Let us recall very briefly the symplectic homology theory, see [CFH, V, C]. For a conjugacy class $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ denote by Λ_γ the space of smooth loops $S^1 \rightarrow T^*X$ whose projection to X represent γ . Let Φ be the set of all smooth Hamiltonians $F : T^*X \times S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that there exist a compact subset $Q \subset T^*X$, a strictly convex function $\kappa : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a contact form λ such that $F(p, q) = \kappa(p/\lambda)$ for all $(p, q) \in T^*X \setminus Q$. For $F \in \Phi$ consider the action functional

$$A : \Lambda_\gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad A(z) = \int_z pdq - Fdt.$$

Its critical points are precisely 1-periodic orbits of the Hamiltonian vector field ξ given by $i_\xi \Omega = -dF$. Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$, and put $E_\gamma^a(F)$ to be the homology of the Floer-Morse complex of the set $\{z \in \Lambda_\gamma, A(z) < a\}$ associated to the negative gradient flow of A . We work with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -coefficients, so $E_\gamma^a(F)$ is a vector space over $\mathbb{Z}_2$. There are the following natural maps between these spaces:

- $E_\gamma^a(F) \rightarrow E_\gamma^b(F)$ for all $F \in \Phi$ and all pairs $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < b$;
- $E_\gamma^a(F_1) \rightarrow E_\gamma^a(F_2)$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and all pairs of functions $F_1, F_2 \in \Phi$ with $F_1 \leq F_2$.

Using the second natural map, one defines the symplectic homology $E_\gamma^a(U)$ of a bounded domain $U \subset T^*X$ as the (unique!) direct limit of the spaces $E_\gamma^a(F)$, where F runs over the set $\{F \in \Phi, F|_{U \times S^1} \leq 0\}$ directed by the natural partial order $\leq$ on functions. The natural maps above respect the direct limit and give rise to natural maps

- $E_\gamma^a(U) \rightarrow E_\gamma^b(U)$ for $a < b$;
- $E_\gamma^a(V) \rightarrow E_\gamma^a(U)$ for $U \subset V$.

Define $E_\gamma^\infty(U)$ as the direct limit of $E_\gamma^a(U)$ when $a \rightarrow +\infty$. Let us list some properties of symplectic homology (all of them besides 4.3 are simple consequences of definitions).

4.1. $E_\gamma^a(cU) = E_\gamma^{ca}(U)$ for all $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $a \in \mathbb{R} \cup +\infty$.

4.2. Let $h : T^*X \rightarrow T^*X$ be a symplectomorphism of T^*X which is $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant outside a compact set. Denote by $J : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ the map induced by h . Then h induces an isomorphism

$$E_\gamma^a(U) \rightarrow E_{J\gamma}^a(h(U)).$$

4.3 (Viterbo[V], Weber[W]). Let $U = U_\lambda$ be the domain associated to a contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+ T^*X$ defined by formula (3) of §3. Then $E_\gamma^\infty(U) = H_*(\Lambda_\gamma, \mathbb{Z}_2)$.

4.4. Let λ be a contact form on $\mathbb{P}_+ T^*X$. Put

$$l_\gamma(\lambda) = \inf_z \int_z pdq,$$

where the infimum is taken over all closed characteristics of the hypersurface $\{p = \lambda\} \subset T^*X$. Here each closed characteristic is equipped with the natural orientation. Then $E_\gamma^a(U_\lambda) = 0$ for every $a < l_\gamma(\lambda)$.

For a contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ define $\nu_\gamma(\lambda)$ as the infimum of those $a \in \mathbb{R}$ for which the natural map $E_\gamma^a(U_\lambda) \rightarrow E_\gamma^\infty(U_\lambda)$ does not vanish. The following properties of ν are important for our purposes.

4.5. The quantity $\nu_\gamma(\lambda)$ is finite (see 4.3 above) and satisfies $\nu_\gamma(\lambda) \geq l_\gamma(\lambda)$ (see 4.4 above).

4.6. If $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$ then $\nu_\gamma(\lambda_1) \leq \nu_\gamma(\lambda_2)$. Indeed, $U_{\lambda_1} \subset U_{\lambda_2}$, and the desired statement follows from the sequence of maps

$$E_\gamma^a(U_{\lambda_2}) \rightarrow E_\gamma^a(U_{\lambda_1}) \rightarrow E_\gamma^\infty(U_{\lambda_1}) = E_\gamma^\infty(U_{\lambda_2}).$$

Here all the arrows as well as their composition are natural maps considered above.

4.7. $\nu_\gamma(c\lambda) = c\nu_\gamma(\lambda)$ for all $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

4.8. Let $h : T^*X \rightarrow T^*X$ be a symplectomorphism of T^*X which is $\mathbb{R}_+$ -equivariant outside a compact set. Denote by $J : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ the map induced by h . Let λ_1 and λ_2 be contact forms on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ such that $h(U_{\lambda_1}) = U_{\lambda_2}$. Then $\nu_{J\gamma}(U_{\lambda_1}) = \nu_\gamma(U_{\lambda_2})$. This is an immediate consequence of 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.4: Take a contactomorphism $f \in \Gamma_e$ and consider its lift ϕ to T_0^*X . Take any contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$. Modifying ϕ in a neighbourhood of the zero section and extending it to the zero section as in Proposition 3.3 we get a symplectomorphism h which preserves the zero section such that $h(U_\lambda) = U_{(f^*)^{-1}\lambda}$. Using properties 4.6-4.8 we get that

$$d([\lambda], [(f^*)^{-1}\lambda]) \geq \left| \log \frac{\nu_{J\gamma}(\lambda)}{\nu_\gamma(\lambda)} \right|,$$

where $[\lambda]$ and $[(f^*)^{-1}\lambda]$ are the classes of the corresponding contact forms in the moduli space W and d is the pseudo-metric on W defined in §3.

Thus Proposition 3.1 combined with 4.5 yield the inequality

$$\chi(f) \geq \sup_\gamma \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \nu_{J^n \gamma}(\lambda) \geq \sup_\gamma \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log l_{J^n \gamma}(\lambda)$$

which is valid for every contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$. Denote the expression on the right hand side by K_λ . Take λ to be the contact form associated to a Riemannian metric on X . Then $l_\gamma(\lambda)$ is the length of the shortest loop in the free homotopy class γ . It follows from [Gr2], 3.22 that for every system of generators in $\pi_1(X)$ there exists $c > 1$ such that

$$c^{-1} \ell(\gamma) \leq l_\gamma(\lambda) \leq c \ell(\gamma),$$

where $\ell(\gamma)$ is the minimal word length of an element of $\pi_1(X)$ representing γ (see §1). Thus $K_\lambda = \bar{s}(J)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

5 Discussion and open problems

We start our discussion with the following well known fact. For a diffeomorphism f of a manifold M define its leading Lyapunov exponent by

$$\text{Lyap}(f) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \max_{x \in M} |\log |D_x(f^k)| |,$$

where $|D_x f|$ denotes the operator norm of the differential of f at a point x with respect to some fixed Riemannian metric on M .

Fact 5.1. *A diffeomorphism inducing a hyperbolic automorphism in the m -th (co)homology of a manifold has a strictly positive leading Lyapunov exponent.*

Our results described in §1 can be considered from two slightly different viewpoints. First, they refine the statement of 5.1 for contactomorphisms of $M = \mathbb{P}_+ T^*X$ in the case $m = 1$. Indeed, the invariant $\chi(f)$ can be considered as the Lyapunov exponent in the direction transversal to the contact structure, so a priori it can be smaller than the leading Lyapunov exponent $\text{Lyap}(f)$, and hence might vanish. We show that this is not the case.

From another viewpoint, Corollary 1.5 is a *contactization* of 5.1 in the case $m = 1$. Indeed, let e be a diffeomorphism of the base X acting hyperbolically in (co)homology. Let $\tilde{e}$ be its canonical lift to the contactomorphism of $\mathbb{P}_+ T^*X$. Then obviously $\chi(\tilde{e}) = \text{Lyap}(e) > 0$. Corollary 1.5 extends this inequality to the whole connected component of $\tilde{e}$ in the group of contactomorphisms.

The proof of 5.1 is based on a transparent (classical) geometric idea. Since f acts hyperbolically in homology, the volume of the images of certain m -cycles in M under the iterations of f grows exponentially fast, thus the norm of $D(f^k)$ must grow exponentially fast, so $\text{Lyap}(f) > 0$. The approach we used in §4 can be considered as a combination of this simple geometric idea (in the case $m = 1$) with Floer-Hofer symplectic homology theory which enabled us to use symplectic action on T^*X as a substitute for the length of loops on X .

It sounds likely that Theorem 1.4 remains true without the assumption on the isotopy class of a contactomorphism. There is hope that this can be done along the lines of §4 but with the use of contact homology theory (see [E2, EGH]) instead of symplectic homology. Moreover, it would be interesting to apply contact homology to the study of dissipation on contact manifolds which are more sophisticated than spaces of cooriented contact elements. For instance, one can expect that the hyperbolicity of a contactomorphism can be detected in terms of its action on contact homology.

The link between shapes and symplectic homology is not totally clear at the moment, however there is an indication that these notions can be considered as dual ones. From a naive viewpoint the duality looks as follows: shapes are responsible for Lagrangian submanifolds of T^*X , and thus are related to closed 1-forms on X , while symplectic homology deals with closed orbits on $\mathbb{P}_+ T^*X$ whose projections define 1-cycles on X . An elaboration of this idea leads to the following problem. Given a contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+ T^*X$, symplectic homology gives rise to a function $N : H_1(X, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow [0; +\infty)$ defined by $N(\beta) = \inf_{\gamma} \nu_{\gamma}(\lambda)$,

where γ runs over all free homotopy classes of loops representing β . It sounds likely that one can stabilize this function by considering

$$N_\infty(\beta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} N(n\beta).$$

Extend N_∞ to $H_1(X, \mathbb{Q})$ by linearity and define a subset $B_\lambda \subset H_1(X, \mathbb{R})$ as the closure of $\{N_\infty < 1\}$. Is there any relation between B_λ and $\text{Shape}(U_\lambda)$? For instance, when λ is a contact form associated to a Riemannian metric on X , there is a strong evidence that both sets are convex and dual one another in the usual sense (see [PS]). Let me present one result in this direction which holds true for every contact form λ on $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$. Namely,

$$\nu_\gamma(\lambda) \geq (b, \gamma) \tag{4}$$

for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ and $b \in \text{Shape}(U_\lambda)$. This translates into the language developed above as $(b, \beta) \leq 1$ for every $b \in \text{Shape}(U_\lambda)$ and $\beta \in B_\lambda$. For the proof of inequality (4) assume that $L \subset U = U_\lambda$ is a Lagrangian submanifold which is Lagrangian isotopic to the zero section and whose Liouville class equals b . There exist $\epsilon > 0$ and a symplectomorphism h of T^*X such that $h(\epsilon U) \subset U$ and $[h^*(pdq) - pdq] = b$. Moreover one can choose such an h so that outside a compact subset of T^*X one has $h(p, q) = (p + \theta(q), q)$, where θ is a closed 1-form on X representing b . One can show that h induces a shift of real grading on symplectic homology: $E_\gamma^a(h(V)) = E^{a-(b, \gamma)}(V)$ for all a and V . Since h takes ϵU inside U we have

$$\nu_\gamma(\epsilon\lambda) + (b, \gamma) \leq \nu_\gamma(\lambda).$$

Using that $\nu_\gamma(\epsilon\lambda) = \epsilon\nu_\gamma(\lambda)$ and taking $\epsilon > 0$ to be arbitrarily small we get inequality (4).

We conclude the paper with the following problem which is absolutely open. Is it possible to contactize 5.1 for $m \geq 2$? More precisely, we ask the following

Question 5.2. *Let e be a diffeomorphism of a closed simply connected manifold X which acts hyperbolically on $H^m(X, \mathbb{R})$ for some $m \geq 2$ (for instance, $X = S^3 \times S^3$ and $m = 3$). Let f be a contactomorphism of $\mathbb{P}_+T^*X$ which is isotopic to the canonical lift of e through contactomorphisms. Is it true that f is non-conservative/hyperbolic?*

References

- [C] K. Cieliebak, Handle attaching in symplectic homology and the chord conjecture, Preprint, 2000.
- [CFH] K. Cieliebak, A. Floer and H. Hofer, Symplectic homology II: A general construction, *Math. Zeitschrift* **218** (1995), 103-122.
- [E1] Y. Eliashberg, New invariants of open symplectic and contact manifolds, *Journal of the AMS* **4** (1990), 513-520.

- [E2] Y. Eliashberg, Invariants in Contact Topology, *Proceedings of the ICM, Berlin, 1998*, Vol. II, pp. 327-338 .
- [EGH] Y. Eliashberg, A. Givental and H. Hofer, Introduction to symplectic field theory, to appear in *Geom. and Funct. Anal.*
- [EP1] Y. Eliashberg and L. Polterovich, New applications of Luttinger's surgery, *Comm. Math. Helv.* **69**(1994), 512-522.
- [EP2] Y. Eliashberg and L. Polterovich, Partially ordered groups and geometry of contact transformations, to appear in *Geom. and Funct. Anal.*
- [FLP] A Fathi, F. Laudenbach and V. Poenaru, Travaux de Thurston sur les surfaces, *Asterisque* **66-67** (1979).
- [Gr1] M. Gromov, Pseudoholomorphic curves in symplectic manifolds, *Invent. math.* **82**(1985), 307-347.
- [Gr2] M. Gromov, *Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian Spaces*, Birkhäuser, 1998.
- [KH] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [LP] F. Lalonde and L. Polterovich, Symplectic diffeomorphisms as isometries of Hofer's norm, *Topology* **36** (1997), 711-727.
- [MS] D. McDuff and D. Salamon, *Introduction to Symplectic Topology*, Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [Mo] J. Moser, On the volume elements on a manifold, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **120** (1965), 286-294.
- [PS] L. Polterovich and K.F. Siburg, in preparation.
- [S1] J.-C. Sikorav, Rigidité symplectique dans le cotangent de $\mathbb{T}^n$, *Duke Math. J.*, **59**(1989), 759-763.
- [S2] J.-C. Sikorav, Quelques proprietes des prolongements lagrangiens, *Mem. Soc. Math. France* **119**(1991), 151 -167.
- [V] C. Viterbo, Functors and computations in Floer homology with applications – I and II, *Geom. and Funct. Anal.* **9** (1999), 985-1033 and Preprint, 1998.
- [W] J. Weber, *J*-holomorphic curves in cotangent bundles and the heat flow, PhD thesis, TU Berlin, 1999.